## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHRISTOPHER SLOAN

533 Rising Sun Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19120

Plaintiff,

**CIVIL ACTION** 

No.:

PHILADELPHIA WATER DEPARTMENT:

ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor

1101 Market Street

٧.

Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

HOWARD NEUKRUG

c/o Philadelphia Water Department

ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor

1101 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

MATT MOSES

c/o Philadelphia Water Department

ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor

1101 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

GREG SHAFER

c/o Philadelphia Water Department

ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor

1101 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

FRAN MIERS

c/o Philadelphia Water Department

ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor

1101 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

THE STANFORM

DREW FELDER c/o Philadelphia Water Department ARAMark Tower - 5th Floor 1101 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19107

Defendants.

### CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Christopher Sloan (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

### I. Introduction

1. Plaintiff initiates the instant action to redress violations by Defendants of the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA" - 29 U.S.C. §§2601 *et. seq.*). Plaintiff was unlawfully terminated by Defendants, and he suffered damages more fully described/sought herein.

### II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 2. This action is initiated pursuant to a federal law. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in <u>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</u>, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.

4. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because Defendant resides in and/or conducts business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

### III. Parties

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
  - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 7. Defendant Philadelphia Water Department (hereinafter "Defendant Department") is a component of the City of Philadelphia that provides water services to individuals throughout the city of Philadelphia and the greater Philadelphia Region. Additionally, Defendant Department is known as a collection of assets, real and personal, owned and operated by the City of Philadelphia, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 8. Defendant Howard Neukrug (hereinafter "Defendant Neukrug") is upon information and belief the commissioner and/or a high-level manager of Defendant Department who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendant Department including but not limited to their termination.
- 9. Defendant Matt Moses (hereinafter "Defendant Moses") is upon information and belief a manager of Defendant Department who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendant Department including but not limited to their termination.

- 10. Defendant Greg Shafer (hereinafter "Defendant Shafer") is upon information and belief a crew chief and/or a manager of Defendant Department who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendant Department including but not limited to their termination.
- 11. Defendant Drew Felder (hereinafter "Defendant Felder") is upon information and belief a manager of Defendant Department who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendant Department including but not limited to their termination.
- 12. Defendant Fran Miers (hereinafter "Defendant Miers") is upon information and belief a manager of Defendant Department who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendant Department including but not limited to their termination.
- 13. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants and/or employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

### IV. Factual Background

- 14. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
  - 15. Plaintiff is a 47-year-old male.
  - 16. Plaintiff initially worked for Defendant Department in the 1990s.
- 17. Following a long dispute about being improperly being placed out of work in the 1990s and early 2000 timeframe, Plaintiff was ultimately reinstated to work in the timeframe of 2007.

- 18. Following Plaintiff's aforesaid reinstatement, Plaintiff was rehired by Defendant Department and placed in different position in or about 2007 than he had previously held.
- 19. From in or about 2007 until Plaintiff's termination, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant Department as a semi-skilled laborer.
- 20. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant Department, he suffered from various health problems including but not limited to high blood pressure and diabetes.
- 21. As a result of Plaintiff's aforementioned health issues, Plaintiff suffered low blood sugar and may have appeared fatigued on occasion.
- 22. Defendant Department's management, including but not limited to Defendants Moses and Shafer, were aware that Plaintiff was suffering from health issues.
- 23. Plaintiff notified Defendant Department's management that he had health problems.
- 24. Defendant Department's management, including but not limited to Defendants Moses and Shafer, were aware that Plaintiff would need periodic days off from work because of his health issues.
- 25. Plaintiff requested FMLA leave from Defendant Department and was approved for intermittent leave because of his health issues.
- 26. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant Department, Plaintiff was supervised by Defendants Moses and Shafer.
- 27. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant Department, Defendant Neukrug was the commissioner of Defendant Department.

- 28. Plaintiff was consistently harassed and treated in a discriminatory manner by Defendants because of his requests for FMLA-qualifying medical leave, including but not limited to being given unfavorable and/or difficult work assignments and aggressive monitoring (when other non-FMLA employees were not).
- 29. During his employment with Defendants, Defendants accused Plaintiff of sleeping on the job in retaliation for his requests for FMLA leave.
- 30. Plaintiff's management also made derogatory comments about him needing FMLA leave including that he abused the leave and questioned the validity of his health conditions when Plaintiff attempted to take FMLA-qualifying time off from work.
- 31. In or about February of 2011, Plaintiff was selectively disciplined by Defendants and suspended for several days in retaliation for his FMLA leave requests.
- 32. In a letter dated on or about August 26, 2011, Defendant Neukrug terminated Plaintiff from his employment with Defendants.
- 33. Defendant Felder and Defendant Miers participated in the decision to terminate Plaintiff.

# Count I <u>Violation of the Family and Medical Leave ACT ("FMLA")</u> (Interference & Retaliation) - Against All Defendants -

- 34. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 35. Plaintiff was an eligible employee under the definitional terms of the Family and Medical Leave Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2611(a)(i)(ii).
- 36. Plaintiff requested leave from Defendants, his employer, with whom he had been employed for at least twelve months pursuant to the requirements of 29 U.S.C.A § 2611(2)(i).

- 37. Plaintiff had at least 1,250 hours of service with the Defendants during his last full year of employment.
- 38. Defendant Department is engaged in an industry affecting commerce and employs fifty (50) or more employees for each working day during each of the twenty (20) or more calendar work weeks in the current or proceeding calendar year, pursuant to 29 U.S.C.A § 2611(4)(A)(i).
- 39. Plaintiff was entitled to receive leave pursuant to 29 U.S.C.A § 2612 (a)(1) for a total of twelve (12) work weeks of leave on a block or intermittent basis.
- 40. Defendants were required to enter into an interactive process with Plaintiff and to inform him of his rights under the FMLA regarding his need to miss periodic time from work and for him to work a reduced schedule, as specifically permitted by the FMLA.
- 41. Defendants unlawfully interfered with Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA and retaliated against him by: (1) terminating him for taking FMLA-qualifying absences and leave; (2) counting FMLA time off from work against him for the purposes of discipline and termination; and (3) by terminating Plaintiff to prevent him from further exercising his rights under the FMLA and because he exercised his rights during the last several months of his employment with Defendants.
- 42. Defendant Individuals to this lawsuit are personally liable because they aided and abetted the interference and personally participated in the retaliation against Plaintiff as described herein.
- 43. These actions as aforesaid constitute both interference and retaliation violations of the FMLA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain their illegal policy, practice or custom of discriminating/retaliating against employees and is to be ordered to promulgate an effective policy against such unlawful acts and to adhere thereto;
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings, future lost earnings, salary, pay increases, bonuses, medical and other benefits, training, promotions, pension, and seniority. Plaintiff should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld from the date he first suffered retaliation/interference at the hands of Defendants until the date of verdict;
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount determined by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be accorded any and all other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate;
- E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;
- F. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiff is to be molded by the Court to maximize the financial recovery available to the Plaintiff in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in applicable federal law; and

G. Plaintiff's claims are to receive trial by jury to the extent allowed by applicable law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF & KARPF, P.C.

3y-\_\_\_\_

Ari Karpf 3331 Street Road

Two Greenwood Square

Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: November 7, 2011

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	Christopher S	10011	:	CIVIL ACTION		
mintel	zhia Water bet	ortment,	et a	NO.		
Titoso	In accordance with the Civil plaintiff shall complete a Cas filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the evidesignation, that defendant sl	Justice Expense e Management Trace a copy on all deferent that a defendabl, with its first ties, a Case Management	and Delay Reduct rack Designation I ndants. (See § 1:0 lant does not agre appearance, subm gement Track Des	tion Plan of this court, couns Form in all civil cases at the tire of the plan set forth on the rese with the plaintiff regarding it to the clerk of court and ser signation Form specifying the	me of everse g said ve on	
	SELECT ONE OF THE FO	LLOWING CAS	SE MANAGEME	NT TRACKS:		
	(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases b	rought under 28 U	J.S.C. § 2241 thro	ough § 2255.	( )	
	(b) Social Security – Cases re and Human Services deny				( )	
	(c) Arbitration - Cases requir	red to be designat	ed for arbitration	under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )	
	(d) Asbestos – Cases involving exposure to asbestos.	perty damage from	( )			
	(e) Special Management – Commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse signanagement cases.)	complex and that	need special or in	tense management by	( )	
	(f) Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.					
	11/7/2011 Date	Avi P.	ENOF	Plaintiff		
	215.659.0801	Attorney-at-	14970	CHANDE KAND	<u> law.</u>	

**FAX Number** 

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Telephone

## Case 2:11-cv-06963-PD Document 1 Filed 11/07/11 Page 11 of 12

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to	be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose o
assignment to appropriate calendar	Philadelphia FA 10170
Address of Plaintiff: 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	THURST THE THE
Address of Defendant:	MUR JONU-DINHOON, HALL
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: DEHOLOWIE DUC	e of labiniss fa 191
(Use Reverse Side For	Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	)) Yes□ No
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Ü
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y	vear previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No□
<ol><li>Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?</li></ol>	suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	
terminated action in this court?	$_{ m Yes}\Box$ $_{ m No}\Box$
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	nts case filed by the same individual?
appens, or pro to contract the	Yes No
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases;
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5.   Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. 🗆 Other Personal Injury (Please
- 1	specify)
7. Secivil Rights	7.   Products Liability
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8.   Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11.   All other Federal Question Cases	
(Please specify)  ARBITRATION CERT	CIETCATION
(Check Appropriate C	Category)
Counsel of record do hereby cert Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and	
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	r belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	00000
DATE: 11 + W	HRY-270T
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.# (115.29)
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	nounal
DATE: 11 17 W	HKK-2449+
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.# //152Q
CIV. 609 (6/08)	

## Case 2:11-cv-06963-PD Document 1 Filed 11/07/11 Page 12 of 12 CIVIL COVER SHEET

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

DATE

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	THE RESTER	tion the following		DEFENDANTS			<del></del>		
				DEFENDANTS  SHIP ADEL DIVINA MATER DEPARTMENT					
LOAN, CHRISTOPHER				PHILADELPHIA WATER DEPARTMENT, et al.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, Telephone Nu	mber and Email Add	ress)	NOTE: IN LAN	D CONDEMN	ATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATI	ON OF TI	JE.
Karpf & Karpf, P.C., Tw Suite 128, Bensalem P. karpf@karpf-law.com			ad,		INVOLVED.			on or n	ii.
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place on "Y" in (	Ina Bay fa	- Di-i-siff
	,	,		(For Diversity Cases Only)			and One Box fo	or Defenda	ınt)
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	lot a Party)	Citize		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi		PTF □ 4	DEF 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗆 2	Incorporated and I of Business In		<b>□</b> 5	<b>□</b> 5
				en or Subject of a □ reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box On	ly)							
MANAGEMENT NEW YORK	PERSONAL INJURY				1				
□ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 341 Voting □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR  362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractic  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  \$150 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus:  530 General  535 Death Penalty  540 Mandamus & Ott  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition		O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug S Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liquor Laws O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health O Other HABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Railway Labor Act O Other Labor Litigation I Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act Naturalization Application Habor S Corpus Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions	423 Without 28 US	IN COLOR OF THE WAR TO	470 Rackete   Corrupt   480 Consum   480 Consum   490 Cable/S   810 Selectiv   Exchang   875 Custom   12 USC   890 Other St   891 Agricult   892 Econom   893 Enviror   894 Energy   895 Freedon   Act   900Appeal of   900Appeal of   190 Corrupt   190 Cor	st und Banking orce strion ber Influence Organizati ner Credit lat TV ve Service es/Commonge er Challeng 3410 tatutory Actural Acts lie Stabilizz mmental Ma Allocation in of Inform of Fee Dete See attionality of the strip of t	ged and dities/ ge etions ation Act atters Act action smination ss
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Re	ON    Cite the U.S. Civil State	Appellate Court ute under which you a lical Leave Act	Reor re filing ( FMLA	stated or 5 Trans anoth (spec	al statutes u	☐ 6 Multidist Litigation nless diversity):	rict 7 N	Appeal to udge from Magistrate udgment	1 
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.	23				URY DEMAND	-	□ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See instructions)	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
Explanation:		(E)	>						

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD